

REMARKS

The November 15, 2007 Office Action was based on pending Claims 1–11. By this Response, Applicant is amending Claims 1–11. Thus, after entry of the foregoing amendments, Claims 1–11 are pending and presented for further consideration. In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1–11 are in condition for allowance.

OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION

In paragraph 1 of the November 15, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner objects to the form of the disclosure. Applicant respectfully submits that the disclosure includes all necessary parts as required by 35 U.S.C. § 112 and 37 C.F.R. § 1.71, although it lacks section headings to identify each part.

Applicant notes that the guidelines listed in 37 C.F.R. § 1.77(b) are not mandatory. Moreover, since the application was nationalized under the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), it is inappropriate to require such an amendment. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Furthermore, in paragraph 2, the Examiner states that the title of the invention is not descriptive. Applicant has amended the title as suggested by the Examiner.

In addition, Applicant has amended the paragraph at page 7, line 28 through page 8, line 8, of the specification as filed to correct a typographical error; namely, the use of the reference numeral “22” instead of “20” in one place in the paragraph.

OBJECTIONS TO CLAIMS

In paragraph 3 of the November 15, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner objects to the use of the term “further metal strip.” In response, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to read “wherein the source zone, the drain zone and the gate electrode are connected at the surface to a metal source contact, a drain contact and a gate electrode contact, respectively via metal strips” (emphasis added). The use of the term “further metal strip” indicates that the further metal strip is in addition to the metal strips connecting to

the source zone, the drain zone and the gate electrode as described in the specification (see, e.g., paragraph [0028] of the published application—US 2006/0220154).

In paragraph 4, the Examiner objects to Claims 2–9 for containing the phrase “A semiconductor” in the preamble. In response, Applicant has amended the claims, without prejudice, as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that this form is commonly used in a variety of U.S. patents (see, e.g., U.S. Patent No. 6,069,386, which was cited and relied upon by the Examiner in the Office Action). Applicant has also amended Claims 3, 10 and 11 to clarify the claims, as requested by the Examiner.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claim 8 as being indefinite. In response, Applicant has amended Claim 8 to clarify the limitation “said contacts.”

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In paragraph 8 of the November 15, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner states that Claims 1–5 and 7–11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,069,386 to Jos (“Jos”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and the Examiner’s characterization of the cited reference.

Independent Claim 1

With reference to Claim 1, one embodiment of Applicant’s invention comprises a semiconductor device. In particular, amended independent Claim 1 recites, among other things, that “the electrical connection between the further metal strip and the source contact comprises a capacitor.”

Jos does not disclose the semiconductor device of independent Claim 1. For example, in Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 32–63, Jos appears to disclose a further metal strip that serves as a capacitive screening between a gate strip 18 (also referred to as track 18—see col. 3, line 34) and a drain strip 16 (also referred to as track 16). The further metal strip 20 is connected to a source connection 12 via strip 15 by means of a connection 21. Jos does not describe or suggest that the electrical connection (15 and

21) between the further metal strip 20 and the source contact 12 comprises a capacitor. Additionally, neither strip 15 nor connection 21 is suggested to serve as a capacitor in any way.

Because Jos does not disclose each element of amended independent Claim 1, Applicant asserts that Claim 1 is patentably distinguished over Jos, and Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claim 1.

Dependent Claims

Claims 4–5 and 7–11 depend from independent Claim 1 and are believed to be patentably distinguished over the cited reference for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In paragraph 10 of the November 15, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner states that Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jos. Applicant respectfully submits that, in view of the above explanation in connection with Claim 1, Jos does not disclose, teach or suggest a capacitor along the electrical connection between the further metal strip and the source contact. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Jos does not teach or suggest all the limitations of the claim as required to show a prima facie case of obviousness (see M.P.E.P. § 2143.03).

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claim 6 is patentably distinguished over Jos for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Submitted concurrently herewith is an Information Disclosure Statement citing four (4) references. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to consider the pending claims in connection with these references in order to make them of record.

NO DISCLAIMERS OR DISAVOWALS

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicant is not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited

references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If further issues remain, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned such that the issues may be promptly resolved.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 5/15/2008

By: Christian A. Fox

Christian A. Fox
Registration No. 58,507
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20995
(949) 760-0404